



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GOTHIC NOTES

I

On the Gothic Dative Construction ANAHAIMJAIM WISAN, II. Cor.
V, 8

In the following passage, II. Cor. V, 8, *apþan gatraujan jah waljam mais usleipþan us þamma leika jah ANAHAIMJAIM WISAN at frauþin*, 'we are of good cheer and are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord,' we have in Gothic an interesting example of an adjective (*anahaimjaim*) referring to the subject of the principal verb (*waljam*), yet standing in the dative case. Since the principal verb is used with a dependent infinitive (*wisan*), the explanation for the use of the dative instead of the nominative case of the adjective must lie in the nature of the construction of the adjective + the infinitive. Most commentators (cf. Gabelentz, Loebe, Uppström) explain the dative *anahaimjaim* as being due to *unsis* understood with *waljam*. This seems to me, however, to be no explanation at all, first because there is no reason why *unsis* should be used, and secondly because no reason is stated as to why *unsis* should be in the dative case. There can be no question of Greek influence, since the Gothic *anahaimjaim wisan* renders a simple Greek infinitive ἐνδημῆσαι. The whole passage reads in the original Greek: *ὑαρροῦμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον*.

It should be noted in the first place that the infinitive dependent upon *waljam* is the substantive verb *wisan*. That this infinitive is, however, used as an impersonal verb, is evident from the fact that the predicate adjective is not in the nominative but in the dative case (i. e., ANAHAIMJAIM *wisan*). The idea in the passage is, then, literally expressed: "We deem it better (for us=*unsis*) to be at home with the Lord (than to be away from the Lord)." In impersonal constructions with the substantive verb 'to be' the person affected is

regularly expressed in the dative case,¹ but since in the passage in question the pronoun (i. e., *unsis*) is already implied in the principal verb *waljam*, it is omitted in connection with the substantive infinitive *wisan*, but the adjective (i. e., *anahaimjaim*) referring to this pronoun must, nevertheless, still remain in the dative case. The repetition of the pronoun is not necessary, wherever the pronoun is easily understood from the preceding clause; cf. e. g., *gōþ þus ist hamfamma in libain galeipan, þau twos handus habandin galeipan in gaiainnan*, Mark IX, 43 (so likewise Mark IX, 45 and 47).

The chief difficulty in understanding the dative construction in this passage lies, I think, in the fact that the impersonal infinitive phrase, *anahaimjaim wisan*, is separated from the principal verb by another infinitive phrase, *usleipan us þamma leika*, which no doubt is personal in character (i. e., *waljam mais usleipan us þamma leika*, 'we choose rather to go out of the body'), since the impersonal construction with an adjectival idea is chiefly confined to the substantive verb *wisan* and its inchoative equivalent *wairþan*. Were an adjective used with *usleipan*, we should expect the nominative case² (i. e., a predicate nominative **anahaimjai*).

That the dative case of the person with the impersonal verb 'to be' + a neuter adjective is a native Germanic construction there can be no doubt. The vitality of the construction is proved by its frequent occurrence in all the Old Germanic languages and especially in Old Norse.³ In the *Elder Edda* and the language of poetry, where the earlier native syntactical status of the language is more fully preserved, this idiom is extremely common. In the *Sólarljóð* (30), for instance, we read: *gótt er uuammalausum vera*, 'it is well [for a man] to be without fault,' for which we have as a parallel in Gothic, for instance, *gōþ ist unsis her wisan* over against the Greek accu-

¹ Cf. Streitberg, *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, §253, 2; Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik*, III, 1, §64, 1; III, 2, §303, 1, 2, 3.

² Cf. the personal construction of the infinitive (*galeikan*) after *usdauđjam*; *usdauđjam, japhē ANAHAIMJAI japhē AFHAIMJAI, waita galeikan imma*, II. Cor. V, 9 'we make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him.'

³ Cf. Nygaard, *Norroen Syntax*, §100. Nygaard's examples are, however, taken almost entirely from the sagas and later Old Norse literature.

sative of the pronoun, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, 'it is good for us to be here,' Mark IX,5 (so also Luke IX, 33).

But a closer parallel to our Gothic sentence under discussion (*waljam mais usleipān—jah anahaimjaim wisan*) may be seen in the following passage from the *Hávamál*⁴ (70):

Betra er lifðum en sé ólifðum

'it is better [for a man] [to be] alive than dead.' Parallel to *betra* is the Gothic *waljam mais* ('we think it better,' 'we choose rather'); parallel to the impersonal verb *er* is the Gothic infinitive *wisan*; and parallel to the adjective *lifðum* is the Gothic *anahaimjaim*, both adjectives in the dative case referring to the person affected. The pronoun in both the Gothic and the Old Norse is omitted, because it can easily be construed from the context. Now, when we examine the second clause of the Old Norse sentence (viz., *en sé ólifðum*), the parallel with the Gothic becomes even closer, for the adjectival idea expressed by *betra* in the first clause is carried over into the second clause, just as the adjective idea implied in *mais+wajlam* ('we deem it better') is carried over from the first clause into the second clause, *jah anahaimjaim wisan*. In the Old Norse the impersonal construction obtains in both clauses, in the Gothic only in the second clause, because only in the second clause is the substantive verb 'to be' (*wisan*) used.

The impersonal construction of the substantive verb 'to be' + a neuter adjective with the dative of the person affected is so common in all the Old Germanic dialects as to need no comment⁵ (cf. the Gothic *gadof, azetizo, rapizo, aglu, gob ist*, etc.). But in our sentence under discussion the neutral adjectival idea in connection with the impersonal verb 'to be' is not so clearly in evidence, inasmuch as this idea is not expressed thru an adjectival form in direct connection with the infinitive (i. e., **gob anahaimjaim wisan*) but is implied in the verb

⁴ The quotations from the *Elder Edda* are here taken from Hildebrand's edition, Paderborn, 1876. I have chosen this edition (old as it is) because of the excellent normalization of the text.

⁵ A most illuminating discussion of this construction in Anglo-Saxon may be found in Morgan Callaway's monograph "The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon," 1913, chap. IX, "The Predicative Infinitive with Dative Subject," pp. 127-131. Cf. also chap. XVI, "The Infinitive in the Other Germanic Languages" (*ibid.*) pp. 231 ff.

waljam ('we choose' = 'we deem it good'); cf. *waljam mais*—[*unsis*] *anahaimjaim wisan* with *gop ist imma mais*, Mark IX, 42. Since *anahaimjaim* is in the dative case, we must necessarily conclude that the infinitive *wisan* is impersonal in character and equivalent in its finite form to the impersonal *ist*, regularly used with neuter adjectives or with substantives.⁶

This discussion of the dative construction with the impersonal verb 'to be' in Gothic leads me to my final objective, viz., the use of a dative adjective in a much disputed passage of the Old Norse *Lokasenna* (53):

heldr þú hana eina
látir með ása sonum
vammalausum VERA.

Most all commentators are agreed that *hana eina* (3rd. pers. fem. sing.) is used here in place of the first person sing. referring to the speaker, viz., Sif. The sense of the passage is, then: "Let her (= me) alone of all the children of the Aser be without fault." But the adjective *vammalausum* (*vāmlausō*, Codex Regius) 'without fault' is in the dative case. Since both the gender and the case of *vammalausum* (if we consider it as a dative singular) is not in agreement with the construction required after *látir* (cf. *hana eina*, acc. fem. sing.), most commentators have with Pálsson adopted the reading *vammalausa* (acc. fem. sing.).

Detter and Heinzel⁷ (II, p. 263) explain the dative *vammalausum* as due to confusion with the preceding dative *sonom*;

⁶ Cf., for instance, *bruks, wan, ist*. Parallel to the Gothic *naúh ainis þus* (dat.) *wan ist*, Luke XVIII, 22, Mark X, 21, we find in Old Norse, for instance: *Lokasenna* 30.

era þér vamma vant
Voluspá 11.
var þeim vettergis
vant or gulli
Skirnismál 22.
era mér gulls vant

In the Old Norse, *vant* is a neuter adjective.

⁷ "Man verbessert leicht *vammalausa* und erklärt den falschen Dativ aus dem vorhergehenden *gopom*." Why Detter and Heinzel say "aus dem hervorgehenden *gopom*" instead of "aus dem hervorgehenden *sonom*" is not clear to me, since all the readings of the passage have *sonom*^u (not *gopom*) in the line directly preceding *vammalausum*.

which is undoubtedly the correct explanation so far as it goes. But the same commentators seem to think⁸ that the dative *vammalausum* (+*vera*) is here after the verb *látir* analogous in construction with the dative *vammalausum*+the verb 'to be' (*vera*) in its finite form; as, for instance, in the phrase *gótt er vammalausum vera*, *Sólarljóð* 30.

Since the verb *lata* requires an accusative object⁹ (with or without the infinite *vera*), the infinitive *vera* (with *lata*) must be personal in character and therefore there can be no parallel between the personal construction *hana eina látir þu*—*VAMMALAUSUM vera* and the impersonal construction *gótt er VAMMALAUSUM vera*. The infinitive phrase in the former sentence would in its finite form be: *hon ein* (nom.) *er VAMMALAUS* (nom.) with predicate nominative adjective.

This fact is clearly recognized by Bugge in his edition of the *Elder Edda* (p. 121, footnote), where he says: "Dativen *vammalausom* kan jeg ikke ret forklare mig; ti *Sólarlj.* V, 30, L. 6: *gótt er vammalausum vera* og lignende Steder—ere ikke analoge. Kan Dativen være opstaat ved Attraction til *sonom*? Man skulde vente *vammalausa*, hvilket Gunn. Pálsson har villet indsætte."

There can be no doubt but that the first point of confusion in the scribe's mind was the dative form *sonum* which immediately preceded the adjective in question. But possibly the scribe also confused the *personal* with the *impersonal* construction used with the substantive verb *vera*, especially since a dative (*sonum*) intervenes between the finite verb (*látir*) and the adjective in question. In other words we may have here a case of *contaminated* syntax, such as often occurs when one construction suggests another.

Altho the scribe may have been led into using the dative case of the adjective because of the dative form *sonum* immediately preceding, his confusion may have been further increased by the fact that the personal construction with the substantive verb *vera*+a neuter adjective is sometimes inter-

⁸ Detter and Heinzel (*ibid.*): "Aber es bleibt seltsam, dass *Sólarlj.* 30 dasselbe Wort auch in grammatisch auffälliger Weise gebraucht wird, *gótt er vammalausum vera*."

⁹ Cf. Nygaard, *Norroen Syntax*, §89, d. Among other examples Nygaard quotes here: *Visburr lét hana eina* (sc. *vera* *Hkr.* 14, 11).

changeable with the impersonal construction; thus, for instance, we may say either *illt er illum at vera*¹⁰ or *illt er illr at vera*,¹⁰ 'it is bad [for one] to be bad.' But the personal construction (equivalent in sense to the impersonal) with the substantive verb *vera* seems to be extremely rare in the earlier language of the *Elder Edda*. Here I have found only two such cases of the personal construction (over against a very large number of the impersonal),¹¹ viz.,

Hávamál 71.

*blindr*¹² *er betri*
en brendr sé

and

Sigurðarkv. in skamma 61.

*Semri*¹³ *væri Guðrun,*
systir ykkur,
frumver sinum
[*at fylgja dauðum*]

Evidently both constructions (personal and impersonal) were possible even in the language of the *Elder Edda*, and this fact

¹⁰ Quoted from Lund's *Oldnordisk Ordafjningslære*, (Copenhagen, 1862), p. 378. Cf. also Holthausen's *Altisl. Elementarbuch*, §484: "*léttr er lauss at fara*, leicht ist es, frei zu fahren." This construction, however, seems to be confined in prose literature to cases where the infinitive does not have reference to a particular grammatical subject. Where the person referred to is mentioned, the pronoun stands regularly in the dative case with the predicate adjective in agreement; thus, *betra er þér at vera góðum*.

¹¹ Cf. *Hvm.* 123, *Lokas.* 30, *Vqlusp.* 11, *Hamdism.* 15, *Skirnism.* 22, *Fáfnism.* 31, *H. Hjörv.* 34, *H.H.* I, 46, *H.H.* II, 25.

¹² Cf.

Hávamál 70.
betra er lifðum
en sé ólifðum.

It will be noted that in the personal construction both adjectives *betri* and *blindr* are nom. masc. I find in the *Elder Edda* no such construction as *betra* (neut.) *er blindr* which would be exactly parallel to the prose construction *illt er illr* (*at vera*).

¹³ Cf.

H.H. I, 46.
Væri ykkur, Sinjǫlli,
sæmro miklu
gunni at heyja.

In the personal construction (*semri væri Guðrun*) the adjective *semri* is nom. fem., but we have no predicate adjective used after *semri* (instead we have an infinitive phrase *at fylgja dauðum*). If a predicate adjective had been used, it would have been in the nom. case (fem. sg.) in agreement with *Guðrun*, just as *blindr* (nom. masc. sg.) is in agreement with the subject of *er* (*blindr er betri*).

may have contributed to a confusion between the personal and the impersonal construction, even where with the personal construction an accusative (instead of a nominative) is required, as after the verb *lāta*.

Furthermore, there are a few verbs of Commanding which may require either the dative or the accusative of the person + the infinitive; thus, we may say either *hann bauð þeim at fara fyrsta*¹⁴ or *hann bauð þá at fara fyrsta*.¹⁴ It is, therefore, not inconceivable that the choice of the dative or the accusative of the person + the infinitive after such verbs of Commanding may have further confused¹⁵ the scribe so that he used the dative of the adjective (*vammalausum*) + the infinitive (*vera*), where the accusative (i. e., *vammalausa*) is required after the verb of Causing or Permitting (*lāta*). The plural form of the dative *vammalausum* must, however, have been due to a confusion with the plural dative *sonum* of the previous line.

Returning to our passage in Gothic, II. Cor. V, 8, *waljam mais*—*anahaimjaim wisan*, the question arises as to whether the personal construction here after *waljam mais* would have been permissible, i. e., *waljam mais*——**ANAHAIMJAI wisan*. Certain it is that so long as the impersonal construction is used, the adjective in question cannot stand in the nominative case, for there occurs in Gothic no construction parallel to the Old Norse *illt er illr at vera*. Considering further the fact that in the older language of the *Poetic Edda* this personal construction (equivalent in sense to the impersonal) with the substantive verb + an adjective is extremely rare, it seems hardly likely that the personal construction could occur in Gothic (which is of still earlier origin than Old Norse), even after a finite verb like *waljam*. On the other hand, the fact that we have here after *waljam mais* the impersonal construction with the substantive verb lends evidence to the assumption that the personal construction (equivalent in sense to the impersonal) with the substantive verb + an adjective in Old Norse¹⁶ was

¹⁴ Quoted from Lunds *Oldnordisk Ordþjóningslære*, p. 378.

¹⁵ Cf. the same confusion between the dative and accusative + the infinitive in Anglo-Saxon after the verb *lætan*, Morgan Callaway, Jr., "The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon," 1913, chap. IX, "The Predicative Infinitive with Dative Subject," p. 129-130.

¹⁶ Cf. *blindr er betri* = *blindum er betra*, 'it is better (for a man to be) blind.'

not a Common Germanic (*gemeingermanisch*) construction but rather a later specific North Germanic construction. This assumption is further borne out by the fact, as stated above, that this type of personal construction is found chiefly in the sagas and later literature and not in the more archaic language of the *Elder Edda*. The dative adjective *anahaimjaim* in our passage clearly represents the normal construction of the predicate adjective in Germanic after the impersonal substantive verb (*wisan*) + a neuter adjective (expressed or implied).

II

*On the Plural Inflection of Consonantal Stems*a) *Consonantal Stems Ending in -R*

In the plural inflection of Gothic consonantal stems ending in *-r*, denoting family relations, all the forms are phonetically correct¹ except the nominative plural:

Nom. *brôþr-jus*

Gen. *brôþr-ê*

Dat. *brôþr-um*

Acc. *brôþr-uns*

Since the endings of the dative and of the accusative (= P.G. *-m*, *-ns*) are identical with those of the *u*-inflection (*brôþr-um*: *brôþr-uns* like *son-um*:*son-uns*), the nominative plural ending (P.G. *-iz*, **brôþr-iz* > **brôþr-is* > **brôþrs*, cf. O. N. *brœþr*, *feþr*, etc.) was by force of analogy made to conform with that of the *u*-inflection (*brôþr-jus* like *sun-jus*).

The question now arises as to why the form *brôþr-ê* gen. plur. was not driven out by the form **brôþr-iw-ê* in conformity with the endings of the *u*-inflection, just as earlier **brôþr-s* nom. plur. was replaced by *brôþr-jus*.

A possible answer to this question may lie in the fact that in Gothic the genitive plural ending *-ê* was added directly (i. e., without an intervening vowel) to the root of all the vocalic declensions (except the *u*-declension), just as in the case of the consonantal declension. Neither the stem vowel *-a-* in **dag-a-*: **har-ja-* etc., nor the stem vowel *-i-* in **balg-i-* appeared

¹ Cf. Streitberg's *Urgerm. Grammatik*, §179, 2, 3, 4, pp. 251-252. There is no necessity for believing that the accusative plural form *brôþr-uns* is an analogical form, like the nominative *brôþr-jus*, after the model of the *u*-stems, as H. Osthoff maintains, "Zur Frage des Ursprungs der germanischen N-Deklination," *P. B. Beitr.*, III, p. 62.

in the genitive plural *dag-ê: har-jê: balg-ê*. The genitive plural formation of the consonantal stems, therefore, conformed with that of the *a*- and the *i*-stems (*brôþr-ê = dag-ê: balg-ê*). In the nominative plural, on the other hand, there was no such conformity, since here the stem vowel appeared in the vocalic declensions (cf. **brôþr-s* with *dag-ô-s: balg-ei-s: sun-jû-s*). It is possible that the genitive plural form *brôþr-ê*, unlike the nominative plural **brôþr-s*, escaped the analogy of the *u*-declension because of the fact that all noun declensions in Gothic, except the *u*-declension, added *ê* directly to the stem (without an intervening vowel) in the genitive plural. We have, therefore, the example of the *a*- and the *i*-stems as a factor in favor of retaining the regular phonetic form *brôþr-ê*, whereas the nom. plur. formation **brôþr-s* was peculiar to the consonantal stems alone.

b) *The Consonantal Stem *AÚHS-AN-*

We are now fairly certain that all the extant forms of the Gothic word **aúhsa* (= O. N. *uxi:oxi*, O.H.G. *ohso*, Angs. *oxa*) belong to the *u*-inflection with the exception of the genitive plural *aúhsnê*. This assertion is based upon Streitberg's investigations of the Gothic text, as contained in his edition "Die Gotische Bibel" (Heidelberg, 1908), which must certainly be viewed as the final authority regarding the reading of the Gothic text and its relation to the original Greek.² Streitberg's final conclusions as to the correct reading of the Gothic text give us, so far as we possess the evidence, the following inflection of the Gothic word **aúhsa*:

	Sing.	Plur.
Nom.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	<i>aúhsnê</i>
Dat.	<i>aúhsau</i> ³	<i>aúhsum</i> ⁵
Acc.	<i>aúhsau</i> ⁴	_____

We see then that only the genitive plural remained exempt from the *u*-analogy.

² Cf. Wilhelm Braune's review in *Literaturblatt*, Oct. 1908, p. 325-329.

³ Formerly accepted reading, *aúhsan* (Cast.), *aúhsin* (Uppstr.), I. Tim. V,18; Streitberg, p. 425.

⁴ Formerly accepted reading, *aúhsan* (Uppstr.), I. Cor. IX,9; Streitberg, p. 261.

⁵ Formerly accepted reading, *aúhsunns* (Uppstr.), I. Cor. IX,9; Streitberg, *aúhsum us-*, p. 261.

In his review of Streitberg's text (in *Literaturbl.*, Oct. 1908, p. 327) Braune says in regard to the retention of the phonetically correct form *aúhsnê*: "Bemerkenswert, dass auch bei den Verwandtschaftsnamen gerade der g. pl. sich der *u*-Analogie entzog."

Since the Gothic consonantal (*-an-*) stem **aúhs-an-* retained its regular phonetic form in the genitive plural (*aúhsn-ê*) in spite of the *u*-analogy, we may conclude that this fact was due to the same reason as in the case of the consonantal stems ending in *-r* (*brôþr-ê*), i. e., possibly because the genitive plural ending of the consonantal stems conformed with that of the *a-* and the *i*-stems (*aúhsn-ê:brôþr-ê=dag-ê:balg-ê*).

One certain point of contact with the *u*-stems was the dative plural **aúhs-n-um* (= Angs. *ox-n-um*,⁶ O. N. *yx-n-um*: *øx-n-um* with *i*-umlaut from the nom. plur. *yxn:øxn*) which like the genitive plural *aúhs-n-ê* probably appeared with the *Schwundstufe* of the suffix vowel i. e., *-n*, (cf. *ab-n-ê:ab-n-am*, *nam-n-ê;nam-n-am*, etc.). Probably too like the genitive and dative plural stem the stem of the accusative plural likewise appeared with the *Schwundstufe*⁷ of the suffix vowel, i. e., **aúhs-n-*, which with the regular ending *-þs* would give us **aúhsn-uns*⁸ (like *brôþr-uns*). Indeed, we may conclude that the *Schwundstufe* of the suffix vowel obtained thruout the plural in Gothic, just as in the consonantal stem **man-n-*. This contention is borne out by the fact that in North and West Germanic the plural forms likewise appear with the *Schwundstufe* of the suffix vowel, cf. O. N. *yxn*, nom. and acc., *yxna* (*uxna*) gen., *yxnum* dat. and Angs. *æxen:exen* (along side of *oxan*, later form) nom. and acc., *oxna* gen., *oxnum* dat., for it is not likely, as Kauffmann points out (*P. B. Beitr.*, XII, p. 543, Anm.) that from the genitive plural alone (i. e., Goth. *aúhsnê*,

⁶ Cf. O. Fris. *âch-n-um*, *âch-n-on* (*Rüstr.* 29, 27) dat. plur. (Angs. *êag-um*), and the Angs. dat. plur. *wordig-n-um*, *beo-n-um*, *flâ-n-um*, etc.

⁷ Cf. Streitberg's *Urgerm. Grammatik* §180, 2, p. 256; R. Kögel, *P. B. Beitr.*, VIII, p. 115 f. and F. Kauffmann, *ibid.*, XII, p. 543 f.

⁸ Cf. Sanskrit *ukṣñ-âs*, Greek *âpr-as*. For the relation of the *Schwundstufe* to the *Vollstufe* of the suffix vowel in the Germanic weak declension see H. Osthoff, "Zur Frage des Ursprungs der germanischen *N*-Declination." *P. B. Beitr.*, III, p. 1-89 and "Zur Geschichte des schwachen deutschen Adjektivums," *Forschungen im Gebiete der indogermanischen nominalen Stammbildungslehre* II, 1876.

O. N. *uxna* (for **oxna*), Angs. *oxna*⁹) the syncopated form of the root (P. G. **ohs-n-*) could only later in the various dialects have spread to all the other cases of the plural.

The loss of the *-n-* suffix in the *u*-forms of the Gothic word may have been due to the example of the nominative singular **aúhsa*, in which the *-n-* did not appear.¹⁰ The dative and accusative plural forms **aúhs-n-um*:**aúhs-n-uns* then became *aúhs-um* (I. Cor. IX, 9): **aúhs-uns*, and the word went over without the *-n-* suffix into the *u*-inflection (cf. the consonantal root-stem **fôl-*), except in the genitive plural¹¹ (*aúhsn-ê*).

III

On the Weak Inflection of the Predicate Adjective

The predicate adjective in Gothic is regularly inflected in the strong form, but there are several cases in which the weak inflection is used. The following cases are noted by Streitberg (*Got. Elementarbuch*, §273, Anm. 2): *sa* GAWILJA *ist*, αὐτὸς συνευδοκεῖ Cor. VII, 13; *swa* UNFRÔÞANS *sizub*, οὕτως ἀνόητοί ἐστε Gal. III, 3; *haita*—þô *unliubôþn* LIUBÔN, καλέσω—τὴν οὐκ ἡγαπημένην ἡγαπημένην Rom. IX, 25; *insandidêdun* LAUSHANDJAN, ἀπέστειλαν κενόν Mk. XII, 3.

In all these cases the predicate adjective refers to a person (or persons) and since no arbitrary line can be drawn between the adjective in its purely adjectival function and its use as a substantive, it is most probable that we here have to do with

⁹ That Angs. *oxna* (gen. plur.) is an older form than *oxena* is proved by the fact that *oxena* is not found except in the manuscripts of a later date, cf. F. Kauffmann, *P. B. Beitr.*, XII, p. 528, Anm. The North and West Germanic **ox-na* (O.N. *ux-na*, Angs. *ox-na*) may therefore be directly derived from Gothic *aúhs-nê*. Similarly, North and West Germanic **ux-n-um* dat. plur. (O.N. *yx-n-um*, Angs. *ox-n-um*) may go back to Gothic **aúhs-n-um*.

¹⁰ Cf. the plural forms of weak masculine stems in Old Norse, where the *-n-* suffix is dropped by analogy with the singular forms (e.g., *ux-ar*: *ox-ar* in conformity with *ux-i*: *ox-i*, etc.). The later *a*-forms in Old Norse are without the *-n-* suffix, just as the later *u*-forms in Gothic.

¹¹ It should be noted that also in North Germanic the *-n-* of the stem in nouns of the consonantal declension is more often preserved in the genitive plural than in any other case, cf. fem. *ðn*-stems gen. plur. O.N. *kuin-NA*: *kuen-NA*, *gal-NA* etc., and neuter *an*-stems *hjarl-NA*, etc.

Jellinek's 'semantische Substantivierung'.¹ This is all the more probable in view of Osthoff's² theory (in which Brugmann³ essentially concurs) that the weak adjective in Germanic represents the continuation of the Indo-Germanic *n*-substantive which served to designate *living beings*.

Many more cases could be added to the list (given by Streitberg) of predicate adjectives used in the weak inflection, but since many of these adjectives are restricted to the use of the weak inflection⁴ they have been formally classified as substantives and thereby excluded from the syntactical category of adjectives. Nevertheless, wherever such a substantivized adjective is used in a predicative function it is a question whether there is any essential difference between the usage of such an adjective and the usage of any other predicate adjective in the weak form, such as noted by Streitberg (*ibid.*, §273, Anm. 2). Take, for instance, *unkarja*, which because it is found only in the weak inflection, is classified as a substantive. In the phrase *ni sijais UNKARJA þizōs in þus anstais*, I. Tim. 4, 14, *unkarja* does not differ, for instance, from the predicate adjective *unfrōþans* in the phrase *swa UNFRōþANS sijub*, Gal. III, 3, with respect to the syntactical usage of the weak inflection. Evidently, *unkarja* was restricted to its substantival usage, while *unfrōþs* was not. Why the adjective *unfrōþs* in this particular passage was substantivized, seems to me a purely arbitrary question.

Similarly, Ulfila uses *unwita* (formally classified as a substantive) as well as the adjective *unfrōþs* to translate exactly the same idea as represented by the Greek ἄφρων⁵ 'ignorant,' 'unintelligent.' If *unfrōþs* is in its predicative function substan-

¹ Cf. M. H. Jellinek, *Anz. fda.*, XXXII, 7-8; "Zum schwachen Adjektiv," *P. B. Beitr.*, XXXIV, 581-584.

² Cf. H. Osthoff, "Zur Geschichte des schwachen deutschen Adjektivums," *Forschungen im Gebiete der indogermanischen nominalen Stammbildungslehre* II, 1876.

³ Cf. K. Brugmann, *Vgl. Grammatik*, II, 1², 292 ff.

⁴ The following list of such substantivized weak adjectives is given by Streitberg (*Got. Elementarbuch*, §187, 6): *fullawita*, *unwita*, *ushaista*, *andaneipja*, *alaparba*, *uswēna*, *un-usfairina*, *usfilma*, *qipuhastō*, *inkilpō*, *allawairstwa*, *usgrudja*, *unkarja*, *laushandja*, *ingardja-jō*, *swultawairþja*.

⁵ Cf. οὐκ ἔσομαι ἄφρων, *ni sijau UNWITA*, II. Cor. XII, 6 and μή τις με δόξη ἄφρονα εἶναι, *ibai hwas mik muni UNFRODANA*, II. Cor. XI, 16.

tivized by the use of the weak inflection, I can see no essential difference between this adjective and *unwita*; cf. *swa UNFRÔÞANS sijub*, Gal. III, 3 and *ni wiljau izwis UNWITANS*, I. Cor. X, 1. The difference here lies rather in the formal restriction of *unwita* to its substantival usage, whereas *unfrôþs* had not suffered any such restriction. We may assume that the difference in sense between the substantival and adjectival usage in Gothic was essentially the same as is the difference in New High German between, for instance, *unverständlich* and *ein Unverständiger*, both of which may be used as predicate modifiers of the verb.

When an adjective has become restricted to the substantival usage (cf. Gothic *unkarja*, *unwita*, etc.) new semantic elements are added with a resultant weakening of the original adjectival notion.⁶ Thus, *N.H.G. ein Junge* has come to mean 'a youth,' 'a lad,' a conception in which other semantic notions are prevalent besides that of the original adjective (cf. *ein Junger*). This type of substantivized adjective is designated by Jellinek as "semantische Substantivierung," whereas the type wherein the adjective still retains its regular adjectival inflection (cf. *ein Junger*) is designated as "syntaktische Substantivierung" (*ibid.*, p. 582).

Wherever an adjective has become restricted to a substantival usage (as Gothic *unkarja*, *unwita*, etc.) we are permitted to classify such an adjective formally as a substantive, but I see no reason why any adjective in Gothic should not become substantivized in the same way as *unkarja* and *unwita*, even tho, like *frôþs*, it might also be used with the regular adjectival endings. The attempt to make in such cases a formal distinction between the weak substantive and the weak adjective has resulted in the classification, for instance, of the predicate adjective *unfrôþans* (Gal. III, 3) as *irregular* but the substantive *unwitans* (I. Cor. X, 1) as *regular*, altho both are used in the same construction, i. e., as predicate modifiers of the verb. I can see no difference, for instance, between the nature of the weak predicate adjective *unfrôþans* (Gal. III, 3) and that of the weak adjective *blindans* (*twai blindans*, Mat. IX,

⁶ Cf. M. H. Jellinek, "Zum schwachen Adjectiv," *P. B. Beitr.*, XXXIV, 582 f.

27) or of the weak adjective *daupans* (*daupans ni urreisand*, I. Cor. XV, 16); yet here Delbrück⁷ attempts to distinguish between 'a substantivized adjective' and 'a genuine substantive existing along side of an adjective with like form.' In all these cases the weak form of the adjective simply indicates its substantival usage.

The substantivization of the predicate adjective may, to be sure, have been favored by the peculiar conditions under which the adjective in question was used. Thus, for instance, the use of the weak inflection of the predicate adjective *liubōn* in the phrase *haita þð unliubōn* LIUBŌN (Rom. IX, 25) may have been favored by the fact that this adjective stood in apposition with the regular weak adjective *unliubōn*.⁸ The parallel *τὴν οὐκ ἡγαπημένην ἡγαπημένην* may thus have been better preserved by substantivizing the predicate adjective, i. e., by keeping *both* adjectives weak in the Gothic.

It is impossible to determine whether or not the use of the weak predicate adjective *wundan* in the phrase *þana stainam waitrþandans*——*haubiþ* WUNDAN *brahtēdun*, *kákeinon* λιθοβολήσαντες (Mk. XII, 4) was in any measure due to the parallel usage of the substantivized predicate adjective *laushandjan* in the previous verse (*insandidēdun* LAUSHANDJAN, *ἀπέστειλαν κενόν*, Mk. XII, 3) or, as Lichtenheld suggests,⁹ to the influence of the foregoing demonstrative *þana*, with which *wundan* stands in apposition. But I see no reason why we may not assume that the weak inflection of the predicate adjective both in the case of *laushandjan* and of *wundan* was due to the same cause, viz., to the substantivization of the adjective.

⁷ Cf. B. Delbrück, "Das schwache Adjektiv und der Artikel im Germanischen," *I. F.* XXVI, p. 195: "So wird also *blindans* (*twai blindans*, Matth. 9, 27) wohl nicht ein substantiviertes Adjektivum sein, sondern ein echtes neben dem gleichförmigen Adjektivum bestehendes Substantivum. Gewöhnlich heissen die Toten *daupai*, einigemal *daupans*, was ein sonderbarer Überfluss wäre, wenn eine tatsächliche zweite Substantivierung des Adjektivums vorläge, was aber begreiflich ist, wenn man ein Subst. *daupa* annimmt."

⁸ A. Lichtenheld, however, holds ("Das schwache Adjektiv im Gotischen," *Z. f. d. A.* XVIII, 31) that the weak form of the adjective *liubōn* was most probably *due* to the influence of *unliubōn* which directly precedes it: "Der prädicatsaccusativ *liubōn* hat hier merkwürdigerweise schwache form, da doch sonst alles was prädicat heisst stark geht. doch wird das vorhergehende *unliubōn* die ursache sein."

⁹ Cf. A. Lichtenheld, *ibid.*, p. 31.

The use of the weak adjective in its predicative function seems to me, therefore, satisfactorily explained by Professor Jelinek's theory¹⁰ of 'semantische Substantivierung' which I here quote in full: "Substantivierung des adjectivs ist ein rein syntaktischer begriff; es heisst nichts anderes, als dass ein wort, das formell adjectiv ist, in syntaktischen verbindungen erscheint, die dem substantiv vorbehalten sind. Aus einem adjectiv wird ein substantiv gebildet mit modificierter bedeutung. Die vom adjectiv hervorgehobene eigenschaft dient in dem abgeleiteten wort zur andeutung eines-complexes von eigenschaften. *parba* ist nicht jemand, der etwas braucht, sondern der ständig in not ist, *πτωχός*."

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

Kansas University

¹⁰ M. H. Jelinek, *Anz. fda.*, XXXII, 7.